

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-16 and 19 stand rejected. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of claims 17, 18, and 20, but respectfully defer rewriting claims 18 and 20 in independent form until final resolution of the rejected claims. In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Currently, claims 1-4, 9-16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arslain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,153) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "AAPA") in further view of Ishii (EP 793111) and Flynn (U.S. Patent No. 5,525,971). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims as follows.

In the previous amendment filed on November 18, 2008, Applicants amended claim 1 to recite "a first semiconductor chip configured to transmit load control data and pilot data on a single line. . ." (Emphasis added.) The Office Action has now cited Flynn for this limitation. As justification for its position, the Office Action argues that Flynn discloses that load control data and pilot data are transmitted on a single line citing column 5, lines 27-36 of Flynn. This conclusion is flawed for at least two reasons.

Firstly, Flynn discloses an external bus **80** that is 32 bits wide and that the VLSI tester uses this bus **80** as a 32-bit parallel access port. Flynn further states that an integrated circuit having a reduced width external bus (e.g., 16 or 8-bit external bus) can be used in an alternative embodiment. While the Office Action construes this teaching to reading on the claimed "single line" of independent claim 1, one of skill in the art would know that 8-bit busses enable parallel data transfer. Furthermore, it is clear based on Flynn's disclosure that external bus **80** (or a reduced width external bus) must transfer data in parallel to operate optimally. Accordingly, one of skill in the art would not know to further modify a "reduced width external bus" to read on the claimed "single line" of the instant application.

Secondly, the Office Action argues that load control data and pilot data are both transmitted on Flynn's "reduced width external bus" 80. However, the handshaking, control signals between VLSI tester and the test control 40 of integrated circuit 10 are transmitted via three separate lines on test control interface 90. Specially, the E_RQ line, the E_RQT line, and the E_GT line are used to control the mode of test controller 40. (See col. 5, line 54 et seq.) There is no indication that either load control data and/or pilot data are transmitted from the VLSI tester to the integrated circuit 10 via "reduced width external bus" 80. Rather, "reduced width external bus" 80 is employed to facilitate DMA operation, for example.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that Flynn fails to make up for the deficiencies previously discussed with respect to Arslain, Ishii and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art. As such, Applicants maintain the position that independent claim 1, along with its dependent claims, is patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicants further note that arguments regarding dependent claim 11 that were previously asserted in the November 18, 2008 amendment have not been addressed by the pending Office Action. Specifically, dependent claim 11 requires "wherein the load control data and the pilot data are transmitted in units of frames and are transmitted using time-division multiplexing." As described in the specification at paragraph [0055], the pilot data can be transmitted between the load control data.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art knows that time-division multiplexing is a type multiplexing in which two or more signals are transferred simultaneously as sub-channels in one communication channel. Applicants reiterate that none of the cited references teach or suggest transmitting the load control data and pilot data on a single line. Contrary to the Office Action's position, Arslain does not teach that the load control data and pilot data are transmitted in unit frames. As such, it is not obvious that time-division multiplexing is used. Therefore, Applicants respectfully reassert that dependent claim 11 is also patentable over the cited

references. If this rejection is maintained, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of how the explicitly recited limitation is disclosed in the prior art.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully assert that each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: May 14, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Laura C. Brutman

Laura C. Brutman

Registration No.: 38,395

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicants